UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

12/6/79

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY	)	Docket No. 50-466
	)	
(Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1)	)	

NRC STAFF'S RESPONSES TO JOHN F. DOHERTY'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES

The NRC Staff responds as follows to the fifth set of interrogatories propounded by John F. Doherty to the Staff in the captioned proceeding:

1. (With regard to Interrogatory #1 of my Third Set), that said:

> In the event Applicant is granted a permit to construct two permanent box culverts and a temporary low water crossing approximately 3 miles northeast from Wallis, Texas, by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, will the money expended on the project be credited toward the cost-benefit when the final siting determination is made?

The Corps of Engineers erred: the crossing is approximately 3 miles northwest from Wallis. The crossing is of Allens Creek and the purpose of this is a construction access road, as can be seen from the attached sheet, which is from Applicant's application to the Corps of Engineers of Galveston.

Response

The construction activity described, a construction road/railroad crossing of Allens Creek, requires Corps of Engineers approval, and it is normal for an applicant to obtain permits of this type in advance of final NRC action. Actual construction of this crossing would not be permitted (see 10 CFR Part 50.10) until such time as a Limited Work Authorization or Construction Permit were issued by the Commission. Consequently, no money will be expended

by the Applicant on this construction activity until after a final determination as to site suitability has been made.

2. Is Applicant required to put amendments No. 37 and No. 50 in the copy of the Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (PSAR) with the copy of the PSAR in the Houston Public Library? Currently these are not located there, but they are mentioned in Supplement No. 2 of the SER?

Response

No. However amendments No. 37 and No. 50 should be in the NRC's Local Public Document Room, Sealy Public Library, 415 Main Street, Sealy, Texas 77474.

3. Referring to Sec. 5.2.2(2)(2) on p. 5-3 of Supplement No. 2 of the SER, does the Staff maintain a high flux signal rather than a high pressure signal is superior for initiating reactor SCRAM? If so, why is it superior in these circumstances? If not superior, what dictates its use instead of a high pressure signal?

Response

No. Instead of relying on one signal which is the "best," or "superior," page 5-2 of Supplement No. 2 to the SER indicates that scrams from valve position, neutron flux and high pressure signals are provided. As stated on page 5-3 the Applicant has not confirmed that the pressure signal scram will limit the pressure to less than 110 percent of the design pressure for an overpressure transient event starting from an operating pressure of 1045 pounds per square inch gauge. As stated there, even if confirmation is not forthcoming, the overpressure protection system is still acceptable because either of other two diverse signals, i.e., valve position and flux signals, will limit the pressure to less than 110 percent of operating

pressure assuming both the high pressure and the other diverse signal do not function. If the pressure signal is later confirmed to provide the requisite protection, all three signals would each individually be capable of providing the requisite protection.

4. What required the reduction in number of pressure relief valves since Supplement No. 1 of the SER?

Response

There has been no reduction in the number of safety relief valves since Supplement No. 1 to the SER as is demonstrated by a comparison of Section 5.2.2 of Supplement No. 2 with Section 5.2.2 of Supplement No. 1. The earlier reduction from 22 to 19 was, as is stated in Section 5.2.2 of Supplement No. 1, for Applicant optimization of space utilization within the drywell and was not required by licensing considerations.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland,
this 6th day of December, 1979.